## 21 C.J.S. Courts § 31

Corpus Juris Secundum | May 2023 Update

## **Courts**

M. Elaine Buccieri, J.D.; James Buchwalter, J.D.; Amy G. Gore, J.D., of the staff of the National Legal Research Group, Inc; and Lonnie E. Griffith, Jr., J.D.

- **II. Jurisdiction of Courts**
- C. Jurisdiction of Subject Matter or Cause of Action
- 2. Amount in Controversy Within Subject Matter Jurisdiction
- b. Determination of Amount in Controversy Within Subject Matter Jurisdiction
  - § 31. Costs included as amount in controversy for subject matter jurisdiction

Topic Summary | References | Correlation Table

## **West's Key Number Digest**

West's Key Number Digest, Courts 121(5), 169(4)

In general, costs, including protest fees, do not constitute a part of the amount in controversy for jurisdictional purposes, but when they are included in a judgment which is the subject of another and independent suit, they are a part of the amount in controversy.

In some states, costs incident to a judicial proceeding are not a part of the recovery claimed and are not considered in determining the amount in controversy as bearing on the jurisdiction of the court<sup>1</sup> although costs included in a demand as a component of the original amount sought and awarded in a prior action are part of the amount in controversy, as opposed to costs accruing in the present action.<sup>2</sup>

Other states include court costs in the instant proceeding for purposes of the jurisdictional amount calculation.<sup>3</sup>

Westlaw. © 2023 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

			4	
н.	ററ	tn	ote	ď
1	$\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}$	un	$\sigma \alpha$	<i>.</i>

1	Haw.—Jen-Pac Travel Service, Inc. v. Fung Lee Kwong Co., Ltd., 72 Haw. 228, 814 P.2d 393 (1991).	
	Ohio—Schultz v. Wurdlow, 2012-Ohio-3163, 2012 WL 2859914 (Ohio Ct. App. 10th Dist. Franklin County 2012).	
	Wis.—Reusch v. Roob, 2000 WI App 76, 234 Wis. 2d 270, 610 N.W.2d 168 (Ct. App. 2000).	
2	Ohio—Bowling v. Stafford & Stafford Co., L.P.A., 2008-Ohio-3768, 2008 WL 2924738 (Ohio Ct. App. 1st Dist. Hamilton County 2008).	
3	Tex.—Terra XXI, Ltd. v. AG Acceptance Corp., 280 S.W.3d 414 (Tex. App. Amarillo 2008).	

**End of Document** 

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.